

The Sun.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1887.

John Sherman and John Ingalls.

The reason, charitably or uncharitably assigned, for the resignation of JOHN SHERMAN from the post of temporary President of the Senate is that he means to give a boost to his boom for another Presidency, the salary of which is greater by forty-two thousand dollars a year. Honest JOHN has never been known to give something for nothing, and his ambition is checked only by his thrift. If he voluntarily resigns three thousand dollars a year, it is perfectly natural to suppose that he knows what he is about; and he may be right in supposing that he will advertise himself in larger letters by coming down from that dais of boredom on which the President of the Senate sits with no power to claim the right of sanctuary in the cloak room, though assailed by many mouldy metaphors and drenched with the chilly stream of Senatorial eloquence.

The Dickinsonian statesman is perhaps right in resigning. He might come to be a mere wooden man, an animated gavel, a breaker to the storms of oratory, a human sounding board. He has rescued himself, but what of his boom? We say it in no spirit of unkindness, but that boom is ancient and eastman, and hardly worth digging up. Ohio venerates JOHN, and certain Ohio politicians are anxious to make him President so as to get him out of the Senate; but are Republican Buckeyes capable of political good faith? The grizzled old financier of Mansfield has good cause to doubt it. He knows them, and they know it. They fled from him the nomination for President. Then they almost kept him out of the Senate, which he has the pretension of not being a member of. The usual Ohio Republican politician is a clear case of viper.

Slack at home, what prop has Mr. SHERMAN elsewhere? The confidence of the "conservative and business interests"? If so, he is a dead man politically; for these seem to be fatal to a candidate. The truth is that Mr. SHERMAN, however valuable for his associations, is not a popular man; and he is less likely than ALBION, for instance, to succeed Mr. BLAINE if that gentleman should not care to try his luck again. And if there is any yearning for a SHERMAN, the great controversialist and dinner orator, TUDMAN, is the SHERMAN in question.

In the fine Italian lineaments of Mr. SHERMAN's successor in the Presidency of the Senate, a successful eligible candidate may be seen. Mr. INGALLS, the powerful and acute rejoinder for some time caused a one-sided and false image of the man to be reflected on the mind of his party. Everybody perceived his ability, but many thought of him as of a cold, raping, and disagreeable person, an edged tool of debate. It has slowly become evident to his party that he combines with great intellectual self-possession a fervid temperament and popular instincts; and he is a Republican of the straight sect. Just at this time when, by a natural reaction, hearty and offensive partisanship is more popular than ever, a Republican like Mr. INGALLS is especially interesting to his party. Moreover, the Kansas wit is the Blainest of BLAINE men, and accordingly could command, in certain contingencies, the strongest forces in contemporary Republicanism. It is conceivable that his religious views may be a stumbling block in the way of his further political advancement. Still, if Westward the course of nomination takes its way, it may connect with Mr. INGALLS. He could do a great deal worse.

Probably Mr. INGALLS takes the Presidency of the Senate as a rest. It will be curious if he does not resign it in December. He makes a good referee, but there is more glory to be got in fighting; and Mr. INGALLS, to apply to him what RUFUS CHOATE said of the second ADAMS, has an unerring instinct for the jugular vein of his adversary.

What the Colored People Think.

A new magazine, edited by colored men in the interests of their race, has been started in Boston, called the *Negro-American*, and the first number promises well for the success of the venture.

Like the quarterly review which was established at Philadelphia a year or two ago to represent the best thought of the colored people, this magazine is distinguished by discussions of the most important and far-reaching of social and political questions. There is nothing trivial in it, and no attempt is made to compete with the popular magazines that cater to the demand for fiction and light reading, the editors, who presumably understand the literary tastes of their race, taking hold only of subjects which appeal to serious and reflective minds. This is very noteworthy, for it indicates that the colored people have a deep interest in the problems of life and of society which most engage the thought of this period.

The opening and most important article is on "Our Relations to Labor Organizations," and is by Mr. T. THOMAS FORTUNE, whose literary activity and fertility seem to be inexhaustible. For besides editing a paper of his own, he is always ready to furnish elaborate discussions to other periodicals intended for the enlightenment of his race. Mr. FORTUNE is unable to find in Mr. GARLAND's theories a panacea for the ills of society, though he himself is opposed to individual ownership of the land, and sees very clearly that the labor agitators are taking a course which must eventually land them in State socialism, with all its intolerable tyranny. "The theory now is," says Mr. FORTUNE, "that the individual shall be circumscribed in his efforts only in so far as he infringes upon the preserves of his neighbor," while under State socialism "the individual would be circumscribed in all his efforts, except in so far as the State gave him permission to dispose of his time, energy, and money." For a thousand years mankind has been struggling against the interference of the State with individual freedom, and are they ready now to give up the contest and turn about to build up the very despotism against which they have been fighting? "I think not," says Mr. FORTUNE, "who thus indirectly answers the other question he puts to the colored people: "Can we afford to encourage the labor movement when the outcome of it must be the tyranny of the State and the absolute abdication of individual responsibility?"

We learn from another article that the colored soldiers and sailors entitled to pensions are failing to get them because of ignorance. For instance, may not GROVER CLEVELAND have been a heterographer when he signed his name to a letter on civil service reform, dated Dec. 25, 1884, and addressed to the Hon. GEORGE B. LORAN, CURTIS? May not this have been the case of the heterography, with Mr. CLEVELAND writing his own name instead of Mr. EATON's? Mr. CLEVELAND was then in the first flush of his unnecessary gratitude to the Mugwumps, and so may have had Mr. EATON in his mind; and that gentleman, who is seldom known to be satisfied with anything not said or done by himself, expressed satisfaction with that letter. The intrinsic evidence indicates it to be the production of a man who thinks more of civil service examinations than of the Democratic party, and thus there is good ground for believing it a heterographical blunder of political absent-mindedness. If it be objected that Mr. CLEVELAND's course since his administration began has been more or less in accordance with the views laid down in the heterographical letter written when he was still Governor, the reply is that his later course is no part of the *res gesta*, and cannot be admitted as evidence. If it were, the heterography theory might be overthrown. Certainly, if both his letter of acceptance and the letter he sent to General Sherman, Mr. CLEVELAND could show that he had been faithful to the one only by showing that he had violated the pledges in the other.

With his heterographical pledges to Mr. CURTIS the Democrats have nothing to do; but they will continue to insist that he shall keep his pledges to the Democratic party.

Arrests at the Eleventh Hour.

The Hon. WILLIAM E. ENGLISH of Indiana was arrested on Friday night on the Cunard steamship *Eturia*, in a civil suit brought against him in the Supreme Court of this State by LUCY A. CASE.

Mr. ENGLISH had been in this city for a fortnight, staying at the same hotel at which Mrs. CASE lived. She might have brought her suit and obtained an order of arrest against him at any time during that period, but it would not have put him to half the inconvenience, we suppose, that was occasioned by postponing the arrest until the eleventh hour, when the defendant was actually on board a steamer on which he expected to sail for Europe the next morning.

In New York the purpose of arrest in civil cases is not to punish the defendant, nor even to secure the payment of the demand against him. It is merely to make certain that he will appear, so that the court may have jurisdiction over his person when judgment is pronounced. The courts of this State, therefore, have usually insisted that the right to arrest in civil suits should be exercised so as not needlessly to harass, oppress, or annoy defendants.

We know nothing of the merits of this suit against Mr. ENGLISH, but the delay in arresting him can hardly have been prompted by motives which the law sanctions.

The Newfoundland Assembly has unanimously passed a bill prohibiting the sale of liquor to foreign fishermen, and Premier Tupper and Mr. ALEXANDER STANLEY have started for England to procure the royal assent to it. As boycotting is a game that two can play at, Congress, which is busy with its non-intercourse laws, can hardly find fault with this move of the statesmen of St. Johns. In reality, however, this bill, which is chiefly the reward of the fishermen of that coast, and of the Assembly, is aimed more at the French fishermen than at ours. France gives a large bounty, which has enabled them to increase their sales of codfish in northern Italy from 20,000 quintals in 1884 to 100,000 in 1885, and in Spain from 250,000 quintals in 1885 to 500,000 in 1886. This increase is counted on the Newfoundland market, and the Government, whether, however, the British Government will consider the proper remedy to be that of making it unlawful to sell bait to French fishermen and to our own remains to be seen.

Mr. CLEVELAND's friends and supporters will be glad to hear that the bill to amend the Administration office—*Minneapolis Tribune*.

The SUN said it always would support the Administration in its every Democratic act, and the few opportunities that Mr. CLEVELAND has furnished for doing this by an editorial vote for instance, have been seized on with enthusiasm and made the most of, without reflecting that taken as a whole Mr. CLEVELAND's policy has been nine parts Mugwump to one part Democrat.

Mr. GARLAND may be promoted. The post of Secretary of the Treasury is vacant, and the supreme honor of managing the nation's finances might be conferred upon the Pan-Electric partner who now presides over the Department of Justice. If Mr. CLEVELAND were to stand by Mr. GARLAND, and would up his hands, as they say, in the face of an indignant and disgruntled people, why not put him higher than ever by promoting him into the Treasury?

It is safe to say that even if Mr. GARLAND were an inspired financier, Mr. CLEVELAND would not dare to make him Secretary of the Treasury. If the President were gifted with twice his reputed courage, he would still shrink from such aggressive support of the Pan-Electric jobbery as to make Mr. GARLAND successor to DANIEL MANNING. That would be too big a scandal, even for this reform Administration.

But if Mr. GARLAND cannot be Secretary of the Treasury, why is he in the Cabinet at all?

Heterography.

There has lately come into the possession of a Washington real estate agent a deed of trust recorded in the summer of 1884, and the record bears the signature of "JAMES G. LORAN, Recorder of Deeds." The signature is said to be in the handwriting of a FREDERICK DOUGLASS, who was then the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. It is supposed that Mr. DOUGLASS, whose thoughts seem to have been more occupied with the progress of the political campaign than with the routine of his official duties, unconsciously wrote Mr. BLAINE's name instead of his own. His pen, mysteriously guided like a political planchette, marked down, not the name of the Recorder of Deeds, but of the gentleman who, he hoped, would appoint the next Recorder; that is to say, who would appoint again the distinguished Republican orator who is now having a well-deserved period of diversion in foreign parts. The pen of Mr. DOUGLASS was with his heart, and that was with Brother BLAINE's canvass.

This writing of another man's name innocently and ignorantly, instead of of one's own, is an interesting phenomenon. There is no reason why the criminal lawyers should not seize upon it, widen its application, and under the name of heterography make out a valid defence for the gentlemen whose expertness in handwriting leads them to put signatures not their own to negotiable paper. As kleptomania is now made to cover various unauthorized borrowings, so heterography may become a shield for people with an uncontrollable tendency to sign others' names.

Other applications of heterography will suggest themselves. Of course, a whole document, as well as a signature, may be heterographic. For instance, may not GROVER CLEVELAND have been a heterographer when he signed his name to a letter on civil service reform, dated Dec. 25, 1884, and addressed to the Hon. GEORGE B. LORAN, CURTIS? May not this have been the case of the heterography, with Mr. CLEVELAND writing his own name instead of Mr. EATON's? Mr. CLEVELAND was then in the first flush of his unnecessary gratitude to the Mugwumps, and so may have had Mr. EATON in his mind; and that gentleman, who is seldom known to be satisfied with anything not said or done by himself, expressed satisfaction with that letter. The intrinsic evidence indicates it to be the production of a man who thinks more of civil service examinations than of the Democratic party, and thus there is good ground for believing it a heterographical blunder of political absent-mindedness. If it be objected that Mr. CLEVELAND's course since his administration began has been more or less in accordance with the views laid down in the heterographical letter written when he was still Governor, the reply is that his later course is no part of the *res gesta*, and cannot be admitted as evidence. If it were, the heterography theory might be overthrown. Certainly, if both his letter of acceptance and the letter he sent to General Sherman, Mr. CLEVELAND could show that he had been faithful to the one only by showing that he had violated the pledges in the other.

With his heterographical pledges to Mr. CURTIS the Democrats have nothing to do; but they will continue to insist that he shall keep his pledges to the Democratic party.

The Newfoundland Assembly has unanimously passed a bill prohibiting the sale of liquor to foreign fishermen, and Premier Tupper and Mr. ALEXANDER STANLEY have started for England to procure the royal assent to it. As boycotting is a game that two can play at, Congress, which is busy with its non-intercourse laws, can hardly find fault with this move of the statesmen of St. Johns. In reality, however, this bill, which is chiefly the reward of the fishermen of that coast, and of the Assembly, is aimed more at the French fishermen than at ours. France gives a large bounty, which has enabled them to increase their sales of codfish in northern Italy from 20,000 quintals in 1884 to 100,000 in 1885, and in Spain from 250,000 quintals in 1885 to 500,000 in 1886. This increase is counted on the Newfoundland market, and the Government, whether, however, the British Government will consider the proper remedy to be that of making it unlawful to sell bait to French fishermen and to our own remains to be seen.

Mr. CLEVELAND's friends and supporters will be glad to hear that the bill to amend the Administration office—*Minneapolis Tribune*.

The SUN said it always would support the Administration in its every Democratic act, and the few opportunities that Mr. CLEVELAND has furnished for doing this by an editorial vote for instance, have been seized on with enthusiasm and made the most of, without reflecting that taken as a whole Mr. CLEVELAND's policy has been nine parts Mugwump to one part Democrat.

Mr. GARLAND may be promoted. The post of Secretary of the Treasury is vacant, and the supreme honor of managing the nation's finances might be conferred upon the Pan-Electric partner who now presides over the Department of Justice. If Mr. CLEVELAND were to stand by Mr. GARLAND, and would up his hands, as they say, in the face of an indignant and disgruntled people, why not put him higher than ever by promoting him into the Treasury?

It is safe to say that even if Mr. GARLAND were an inspired financier, Mr. CLEVELAND would not dare to make him Secretary of the Treasury. If the President were gifted with twice his reputed courage, he would still shrink from such aggressive support of the Pan-Electric jobbery as to make Mr. GARLAND successor to DANIEL MANNING. That would be too big a scandal, even for this reform Administration.

But if Mr. GARLAND cannot be Secretary of the Treasury, why is he in the Cabinet at all?

Heterography.

There has lately come into the possession of a Washington real estate agent a deed of trust recorded in the summer of 1884, and the record bears the signature of "JAMES G. LORAN, Recorder of Deeds." The signature is said to be in the handwriting of a FREDERICK DOUGLASS, who was then the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. It is supposed that Mr. DOUGLASS, whose thoughts seem to have been more occupied with the progress of the political campaign than with the routine of his official duties, unconsciously wrote Mr. BLAINE's name instead of his own. His pen, mysteriously guided like a political planchette, marked down, not the name of the Recorder of Deeds, but of the gentleman who, he hoped, would appoint the next Recorder; that is to say, who would appoint again the distinguished Republican orator who is now having a well-deserved period of diversion in foreign parts. The pen of Mr. DOUGLASS was with his heart, and that was with Brother BLAINE's canvass.

This writing of another man's name innocently and ignorantly, instead of of one's own, is an interesting phenomenon. There is no reason why the criminal lawyers should not seize upon it, widen its application, and under the name of heterography make out a valid defence for the gentlemen whose expertness in handwriting leads them to put signatures not their own to negotiable paper. As kleptomania is now made to cover various unauthorized borrowings, so heterography may become a shield for people with an uncontrollable tendency to sign others' names.

Other applications of heterography will suggest themselves. Of course, a whole document, as well as a signature, may be heterographic. For instance, may not GROVER CLEVELAND have been a heterographer when he signed his name to a letter on civil service reform, dated Dec. 25, 1884, and addressed to the Hon. GEORGE B. LORAN, CURTIS? May not this have been the case of the heterography, with Mr. CLEVELAND writing his own name instead of Mr. EATON's? Mr. CLEVELAND was then in the first flush of his unnecessary gratitude to the Mugwumps, and so may have had Mr. EATON in his mind; and that gentleman, who is seldom known to be satisfied with anything not said or done by himself, expressed satisfaction with that letter. The intrinsic evidence indicates it to be the production of a man who thinks more of civil service examinations than of the Democratic party, and thus there is good ground for believing it a heterographical blunder of political absent-mindedness. If it be objected that Mr. CLEVELAND's course since his administration began has been more or less in accordance with the views laid down in the heterographical letter written when he was still Governor, the reply is that his later course is no part of the *res gesta*, and cannot be admitted as evidence. If it were, the heterography theory might be overthrown. Certainly, if both his letter of acceptance and the letter he sent to General Sherman, Mr. CLEVELAND could show that he had been faithful to the one only by showing that he had violated the pledges in the other.

With his heterographical pledges to Mr. CURTIS the Democrats have nothing to do; but they will continue to insist that he shall keep his pledges to the Democratic party.

The Newfoundland Assembly has unanimously passed a bill prohibiting the sale of liquor to foreign fishermen, and Premier Tupper and Mr. ALEXANDER STANLEY have started for England to procure the royal assent to it. As boycotting is a game that two can play at, Congress, which is busy with its non-intercourse laws, can hardly find fault with this move of the statesmen of St. Johns. In reality, however, this bill, which is chiefly the reward of the fishermen of that coast, and of the Assembly, is aimed more at the French fishermen than at ours. France gives a large bounty, which has enabled them to increase their sales of codfish in northern Italy from 20,000 quintals in 1884 to 100,000 in 1885, and in Spain from 250,000 quintals in 1885 to 500,000 in 1886. This increase is counted on the Newfoundland market, and the Government, whether, however, the British Government will consider the proper remedy to be that of making it unlawful to sell bait to French fishermen and to our own remains to be seen.

Mr. CLEVELAND's friends and supporters will be glad to hear that the bill to amend the Administration office—*Minneapolis Tribune*.

The SUN said it always would support the Administration in its every Democratic act, and the few opportunities that Mr. CLEVELAND has furnished for doing this by an editorial vote for instance, have been seized on with enthusiasm and made the most of, without reflecting that taken as a whole Mr. CLEVELAND's policy has been nine parts Mugwump to one part Democrat.

Mr. GARLAND may be promoted. The post of Secretary of the Treasury is vacant, and the supreme honor of managing the nation's finances might be conferred upon the Pan-Electric partner who now presides over the Department of Justice. If Mr. CLEVELAND were to stand by Mr. GARLAND, and would up his hands, as they say, in the face of an indignant and disgruntled people, why not put him higher than ever by promoting him into the Treasury?

It is safe to say that even if Mr. GARLAND were an inspired financier, Mr. CLEVELAND would not dare to make him Secretary of the Treasury. If the President were gifted with twice his reputed courage, he would still shrink from such aggressive support of the Pan-Electric jobbery as to make Mr. GARLAND successor to DANIEL MANNING. That would be too big a scandal, even for this reform Administration.

But if Mr. GARLAND cannot be Secretary of the Treasury, why is he in the Cabinet at all?

Heterography.

There has lately come into the possession of a Washington real estate agent a deed of trust recorded in the summer of 1884, and the record bears the signature of "JAMES G. LORAN, Recorder of Deeds." The signature is said to be in the handwriting of a FREDERICK DOUGLASS, who was then the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. It is supposed that Mr. DOUGLASS, whose thoughts seem to have been more occupied with the progress of the political campaign than with the routine of his official duties, unconsciously wrote Mr. BLAINE's name instead of his own. His pen, mysteriously guided like a political planchette, marked down, not the name of the Recorder of Deeds, but of the gentleman who, he hoped, would appoint the next Recorder; that is to say, who would appoint again the distinguished Republican orator who is now having a well-deserved period of diversion in foreign parts. The pen of Mr. DOUGLASS was with his heart, and that was with Brother BLAINE's canvass.

This writing of another man's name innocently and ignorantly, instead of of one's own, is an interesting phenomenon. There is no reason why the criminal lawyers should not seize upon it, widen its application, and under the name of heterography make out a valid defence for the gentlemen whose expertness in handwriting leads them to put signatures not their own to negotiable paper. As kleptomania is now made to cover various unauthorized borrowings, so heterography may become a shield for people with an uncontrollable tendency to sign others' names.

Other applications of heterography will suggest themselves. Of course, a whole document, as well as a signature, may be heterographic. For instance, may not GROVER CLEVELAND have been a heterographer when he signed his name to a letter on civil service reform, dated Dec. 25, 1884, and addressed to the Hon. GEORGE B. LORAN, CURTIS? May not this have been the case of the heterography, with Mr. CLEVELAND writing his own name instead of Mr. EATON's? Mr. CLEVELAND was then in the first flush of his unnecessary gratitude to the Mugwumps, and so may have had Mr. EATON in his mind; and that gentleman, who is seldom known to be satisfied with anything not said or done by himself, expressed satisfaction with that letter. The intrinsic evidence indicates it to be the production of a man who thinks more of civil service examinations than of the Democratic party, and thus there is good ground for believing it a heterographical blunder of political absent-mindedness. If it be objected that Mr. CLEVELAND's course since his administration began has been more or less in accordance with the views laid down in the heterographical letter written when he was still Governor, the reply is that his later course is no part of the *res gesta*, and cannot be admitted as evidence. If it were, the heterography theory might be overthrown. Certainly, if both his letter of acceptance and the letter he sent to General Sherman, Mr. CLEVELAND could show that he had been faithful to the one only by showing that he had violated the pledges in the other.

With his heterographical pledges to Mr. CURTIS the Democrats have nothing to do; but they will continue to insist that he shall keep his pledges to the Democratic party.

The Newfoundland Assembly has unanimously passed a bill prohibiting the sale of liquor to foreign fishermen, and Premier Tupper and Mr. ALEXANDER STANLEY have started for England to procure the royal assent to it. As boycotting is a game that two can play at, Congress, which is busy with its non-intercourse laws, can hardly find fault with this move of the statesmen of St. Johns. In reality, however, this bill, which is chiefly the reward of the fishermen of that coast, and of the Assembly, is aimed more at the French fishermen than at ours. France gives a large bounty, which has enabled them to increase their sales of codfish in northern Italy from 20,000 quintals in 1884 to 100,000 in 1885, and in Spain from 250,000 quintals in 1885 to 500,000 in 1886. This increase is counted on the Newfoundland market, and the Government, whether, however, the British Government will consider the proper remedy to be that of making it unlawful to sell bait to French fishermen and to our own remains to be seen.

Mr. CLEVELAND's friends and supporters will be glad to hear that the bill to amend the Administration office—*Minneapolis Tribune*.

The SUN said it always would support the Administration in its every Democratic act, and the few opportunities that Mr. CLEVELAND has furnished for doing this by an editorial vote for instance, have been seized on with enthusiasm and made the most of, without reflecting that taken as a whole Mr. CLEVELAND's policy has been nine parts Mugwump to one part Democrat.

Mr. GARLAND may be promoted. The post of Secretary of the Treasury is vacant, and the supreme honor of managing the nation's finances might be conferred upon the Pan-Electric partner who now presides over the Department of Justice. If Mr. CLEVELAND were to stand by Mr. GARLAND, and would up his hands, as they say, in the face of an indignant and disgruntled people, why not put him higher than ever by promoting him into the Treasury?

It is safe to say that even if Mr. GARLAND were an inspired financier, Mr. CLEVELAND would not dare to make him Secretary of the Treasury. If the President were gifted with twice his reputed courage, he would still shrink from such aggressive support of the Pan-Electric jobbery as to make Mr. GARLAND successor to DANIEL MANNING. That would be too big a scandal, even for this reform Administration.

But if Mr. GARLAND cannot be Secretary of the Treasury, why is he in the Cabinet at all?

Heterography.

There has lately come into the possession of a Washington real estate agent a deed of trust recorded in the summer of 1884, and the record bears the signature of "JAMES G. LORAN, Recorder of Deeds." The signature is said to be in the handwriting of a FREDERICK DOUGLASS, who was then the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. It is supposed that Mr. DOUGLASS, whose thoughts seem to have been more occupied with the progress of the political campaign than with the routine of his official duties, unconsciously wrote Mr. BLAINE's name instead of his own. His pen, mysteriously guided like a political planchette, marked down, not the name of the Recorder of Deeds, but of the gentleman who, he hoped, would appoint the next Recorder; that is to say, who would appoint again the distinguished Republican orator who is now having a well-deserved period of diversion in foreign parts. The pen of Mr. DOUGLASS was with his heart, and that was with Brother BLAINE's canvass.

This writing of another man's name innocently and ignorantly, instead of of one's own, is an interesting phenomenon. There is no reason why the criminal lawyers should not seize upon it, widen its application, and under the name of heterography make out a valid defence for the gentlemen whose expertness in handwriting leads them to put signatures not their own to negotiable paper. As kleptomania is now made to cover various unauthorized borrowings, so heterography may become a shield for people with an uncontrollable tendency to sign others' names.

Other applications of heterography will suggest themselves. Of course, a whole document, as well as a signature, may be heterographic. For instance, may not GROVER CLEVELAND have been a heterographer when he signed his name to a letter on civil service reform, dated Dec. 25, 1884, and addressed to the Hon. GEORGE B. LORAN, CURTIS? May not this have been the case of the heterography, with Mr. CLEVELAND writing his own name instead of Mr. EATON's? Mr. CLEVELAND was then in the first flush of his unnecessary gratitude to the Mugwumps, and so may have had Mr. EATON in his mind; and that gentleman, who is seldom known to be satisfied with anything not said or done by himself, expressed satisfaction with that letter. The intrinsic evidence indicates it to be the production of a man who thinks more of civil service examinations than of the Democratic party, and thus there is good ground for believing it a heterographical blunder of political absent-mindedness. If it be objected that Mr. CLEVELAND's course since his administration began has been more or less in accordance with the views laid down in the heterographical letter written when he was still Governor, the reply is that his later course is no part of the *res gesta*, and cannot be admitted as evidence. If it were, the heterography theory might be overthrown. Certainly, if both his letter of acceptance and the letter he sent to General Sherman, Mr. CLEVELAND could show that he had been faithful to the one only by showing that he had violated the pledges in the other.

With his heterographical pledges to Mr. CURTIS the Democrats have nothing to do; but they will continue to insist that he shall keep his pledges to the Democratic party.

The Newfoundland Assembly has unanimously passed a bill prohibiting the sale of liquor to foreign fishermen, and Premier Tupper and Mr. ALEXANDER STANLEY have started for England to procure the royal assent to it. As boycotting is a game that two can play at, Congress, which is busy with its non-intercourse laws, can hardly find fault with this move of the statesmen of St. Johns. In reality, however, this bill, which is chiefly the reward of the fishermen of that coast, and of the Assembly, is aimed more at the French fishermen than at ours. France gives a large bounty, which has enabled them to increase their sales of codfish in northern Italy from 20,000 quintals in 1884 to 100,000 in 1885, and in Spain from 250,000 quintals in 1885 to 500,000 in 1886. This increase is counted on the Newfoundland market, and the Government, whether, however, the British Government will consider the proper remedy to be that of making it unlawful to sell bait to French fishermen and to our own remains to be seen.

Mr. CLEVELAND's friends and supporters will be glad to hear that the bill to amend the Administration office—*Minneapolis Tribune*.

The SUN said it always would support the Administration in its every Democratic act, and the few opportunities that Mr. CLEVELAND has furnished for doing this by an editorial vote for instance, have been seized on with enthusiasm and made the most of, without reflecting that taken as a whole Mr. CLEVELAND's policy has been nine parts Mugwump to one part Democrat.

Mr. GARLAND may be promoted. The post of Secretary of the Treasury is vacant, and the supreme honor of managing the nation's finances might be conferred upon the Pan-Electric partner who now presides over the Department of Justice. If Mr. CLEVELAND were to stand by Mr. GARLAND, and would up his hands, as they say, in the face of an indignant and disgruntled people, why not put him higher than ever by promoting him into the Treasury?

It is safe to say that even if Mr. GARLAND were an inspired financier, Mr. CLEVELAND would not dare to make him Secretary of the Treasury. If the President were gifted with twice his reputed courage, he would still shrink from such aggressive support of the Pan-Electric jobbery as to make Mr. GARLAND successor to DANIEL MANNING. That would be too big a scandal, even for this reform Administration.

But if Mr. GARLAND cannot be Secretary of the Treasury, why is he in the Cabinet at all?

Heterography.

There has lately come into the possession of a Washington real estate agent a deed of trust recorded in the summer of 1884, and the record bears the signature of "JAMES G. LORAN, Recorder of Deeds." The signature is said to be in the handwriting of a FREDERICK DOUGLASS, who was then the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. It is supposed that Mr. DOUGLASS, whose thoughts seem to have been more occupied with the progress of the political campaign than with the routine of his official duties, unconsciously wrote Mr. BLAINE's name instead of his own. His pen, mysteriously guided like a political planchette, marked down, not the name of the Recorder of Deeds, but of the gentleman who, he hoped, would appoint the next Recorder; that is to say, who would appoint again the distinguished Republican orator who is now having a well-deserved period of diversion in foreign parts. The pen of Mr. DOUGLASS was with his heart, and that was with Brother BLAINE's canvass.

This writing of another man's name innocently and ignorantly, instead of of one's own, is an interesting phenomenon. There is no reason why the criminal lawyers should not seize upon it, widen its application, and under the name of heterography make out a valid defence for the gentlemen whose expertness in handwriting leads them to put signatures not their own to negotiable paper. As kleptomania is now made to cover various unauthorized borrowings, so heterography may become a shield for people with an uncontrollable tendency to sign others' names.

Other applications of heterography will suggest themselves. Of course, a whole document, as well as a signature, may be heterographic. For instance, may not GROVER CLEVELAND have been a heterographer when he signed his name to a letter on civil service reform, dated Dec. 25, 1884, and addressed to the Hon. GEORGE B. LORAN, CURTIS? May not this have been the case of the heterography, with Mr. CLEVELAND writing his own name instead of Mr. EATON's? Mr. CLEVELAND was then in the first flush of his unnecessary gratitude to the Mugwumps, and so may have had Mr. EATON in his mind; and that gentleman, who is seldom known to be satisfied with anything not said or done by himself, expressed satisfaction with that letter. The intrinsic evidence indicates it to be the production of a man who thinks more of civil service examinations than of the Democratic party, and thus there is good ground for believing it a heterographical blunder of political absent-mindedness. If it be objected that Mr. CLEVELAND's course since his administration began has been more or less in accordance with the views laid down in the heterographical letter written when he was still Governor, the reply is that his later course is no part of the *res gesta*, and cannot be admitted as evidence. If it were, the heterography theory might be overthrown. Certainly, if both his letter of acceptance and the letter he sent to General Sherman, Mr. CLEVELAND could show that he had been faithful to the one only by showing that he had violated the pledges in the other.

With his heterographical pledges to Mr. CURTIS the Democrats have nothing to do; but they will continue to insist that he shall keep his pledges to the Democratic party.

The Newfoundland Assembly has unanimously passed a bill prohibiting the sale of liquor to foreign fishermen, and Premier Tupper and Mr. ALEXANDER STANLEY have started for England to procure the royal assent to it. As boycotting is a game that two can play at, Congress, which is busy with its non-intercourse laws, can hardly find fault with this move of the statesmen of St. Johns. In reality, however, this bill, which is chiefly the reward of the fishermen of that coast, and of the Assembly, is aimed more at the French fishermen than at ours. France gives a large bounty, which has enabled them to increase their sales of codfish in northern Italy from 20,000 quintals in 1884 to 100,000 in 1885, and in Spain from 250,000 quintals in 1885 to 500,000 in 1886. This increase is counted on the Newfoundland market, and the Government, whether, however, the British Government will consider the proper remedy to be that of making it unlawful to sell bait to French fishermen and to our own remains to be seen.

Mr. CLEVELAND's friends and supporters will be glad to hear that the bill to amend the Administration office—*Minneapolis Tribune*.

The SUN said it always would support the Administration in its every Democratic act, and the few opportunities that Mr. CLEVELAND has furnished for doing this by an editorial vote for instance, have been seized on with enthusiasm and made the most of, without reflecting that taken as a whole Mr. CLEVELAND's policy has been nine parts Mugwump to one part Democrat.

Mr. GARLAND may be promoted. The post of Secretary of the Treasury is vacant, and the supreme honor of managing the nation's finances might be conferred upon the Pan-Electric partner who now presides over the Department of Justice. If Mr. CLEVELAND were to stand by Mr. GARLAND, and would up his hands, as they say, in the face of an indignant and disgruntled people, why not put him higher than ever by promoting him into the Treasury?

It is safe to say that even if Mr. GARLAND were an inspired financier, Mr. CLEVELAND would not dare to make him Secretary of the Treasury. If the President were gifted with twice his reputed courage, he would still shrink from such aggressive support of the Pan-Electric jobbery as to make Mr. GARLAND successor to DANIEL MANNING. That would be too big a scandal, even for this reform Administration.

But if Mr. GARLAND cannot be Secretary of the Treasury, why is he in the Cabinet at all?

Heterography.

There has lately come into the possession of a Washington real estate agent a deed of trust recorded in the summer of 1884, and the record bears the signature of "JAMES G. LORAN, Recorder of Deeds." The signature is said to be in the handwriting of a FREDERICK DOUGLASS, who was then the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. It is supposed that Mr. DOUGLASS, whose thoughts seem to have been more occupied with the progress of the political campaign than with the routine of his official duties, unconsciously wrote Mr. BLAINE's name instead of his own. His pen, mysteriously guided like a political planchette, marked down, not the name of the Recorder of Deeds, but of the gentleman who, he hoped, would appoint the next Recorder; that is to say, who would appoint again the distinguished Republican orator who is now having a well-deserved period of diversion in foreign parts. The pen of Mr. DOUGLASS was with his heart, and that was with Brother BLAINE's canvass.

This writing of another man's name innocently and ignorantly, instead of of one's own, is an interesting phenomenon. There is no